

REMARKS**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 are amended herein. Claim 10 has been added. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 are pending and under consideration. Applicants assert that no new matter has been added.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In response to the previous amendments and arguments filed on May 22, 2007, the Office Action, on page 29, alleges that the response does not set forth any specific arguments or rationale as to why the Examiner was incorrect in his analysis.

In the response filed on May 22, 2007, the applicants attempted to clarify that the claims were not obvious in view of the cited art by demonstrating the differences between embodiments of the present invention and that of the prior art. In particular, the applicants attempted to give the Examiner a general understanding of the prior art such that the fundamental differences would be apparent, and thus, would clearly show that the feature of "a designation reception portion receiving, from an administrator, designation of Web page identifying information and user identifying information" as recited in claim 1, for example, is not obvious in view of the cited art.

The Examiner was not persuaded, and accordingly, on page 2, the Office Action maintains the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin et al. (U.S. 6,604,106) in view of Li et al. (U.S. 6,591,266 B1), further in view of Isaac et al. (U.S. Publication No. US 2006/0112172 A1). Once again, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 4, lines 11-12, the Office Action concedes that Bodin fails to disclose "a designation reception portion receiving, from an administrator, designation of Web page identifying information and user identifying information" as recited in lines 14-15 of claim 1. On page 5, third paragraph, the Office Action, however, cites col. 3, lines 37-49, of Li as curing this deficiency. Specifically, the Office Action states that Li teaches that when a request for a dynamically created web page is received, the web server in Li utilizes a common gateway interface to convert the request into a new request which includes the URL and "other parameters" that are interpreted by the server. The Office Action asserts that the "other parameters" of Li disclose the "Web page identifying information and user identifying information" as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion.

Li neither explicitly nor implicitly teaches or describes the features of "Web page identifying information" and "user identifying information."

The specification of the subject application describes a feature of providing the ability for an administrator to reproduce a Web page as previously viewed by a particular user. For example, an administrator of the Web server may receive a question about a method for dealing with an error that is reported to the Web server. A report of an error may, for example, include that no document was found containing an entered keyword or that an error message was displayed despite the user inputting a correct keyword. In most cases, the user who reports the error can only vaguely remember the specifics of the particular Web page and/or the error message that was displayed by the terminal device. The specification of the subject application, however, describes a feature that provides the ability for an administrator to reproduce the Web pages so that it is not necessary for the user to be able to remember the specifics regarding the error.

In a non-limiting example, claim 1 recites:

a contents information process portion making a **storage portion store the entire or part of the contents of the Web page** determined by the operation portion in accordance with the parameter designated by the user **in connection with Web page identifying information on the Web page and user identifying information on the user**

a designation reception portion **receiving, from an administrator, designation of the Web page identifying information and the user identifying information**

(emphasis added, claim 1, lines 5-8 and 14-15).

In other words, an entire or a part of the contents of a Web page is stored in connection with Web page identifying information and user identifying information. This user identifying information provides the benefit that a Web page can be associated with a particular user. The designation portion then receives, from an administrator, designation information identifying the Web page and user. Li does not contemplate, let alone describe or teach, such a feature.

Li merely discusses a system for updating Web pages stored in cache based on modifications to data stored in a database. For example, an objective of Li is to provide a system and method for intelligent caching and refreshing of Web content where, when data in a DBMS or external data source changes, the Web pages stored in cache or Web servers that utilize that data will be invalidated (col. 5, first paragraph). Li is strictly concerned about keeping data that is stored in the cache current for the Web servers. Li's objective is to provide current web content regardless of the particular user viewing the webpage (i.e. anyone on the internet viewing the webpage), and therefore, retaining which user viewed a particular Web page is of no consequence in Li. In fact, Li at column 4, lines 13-21 states that the

Web server 38 sends this dynamically generated page 50 to the Web browser 30, it may also store this page 50 to cache 36... *when another user requests the same information, the Web page 50 can be delivered straight from the cache 36 to the end user, without the additional processing time that would be required if the Web page was to be dynamically created by backend systems (emphasis added).*

In other words, the Web server in Li does not cache pages separately for each user, instead, it shares information in cache for a plurality of users. Accordingly, the "other parameters" as described in Li would not teach or suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art utilizing "user identifying information" because the teachings of Li do not contemplate the ability to associate a cached Web page to a user that has previously viewed the same Web page. Therefore, Li fails to teach or describe at least the feature of "a designation reception portion receiving, from an administrator, designation of Web page identifying information and user identifying information" as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above. Dependent claim 2 inherits the patentable recitations of its base claim, and therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited art for at least the reasons above in addition to the additional features recited therein. Independent claims 8 and 9 recite "receiving, from an administrator, designation of the Web page identifying information and the user identifying information," and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaac in view of Carlson (Patent No. 6,697,849) and further in view of Li.

Applicants submit that neither Isaac nor Carlson, individually or combined, cure the deficiencies of Li described above. Accordingly, claims 4, 5 and 7 patentably distinguish over the cited art. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

III. NEW CLAIM

Applicants assert that new claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Claim 10 recites:

a contents information process portion making a storage portion store the entire or part of the contents of the Web page **in connection with Web page identifying information** on the Web page, **user identifying information** on the user and **date-and-time specifying information specifying date-and-time** when the entire or part of the contents is determined by the operation portion

(lines 4-8, emphasis added). As shown in Section II., the cited art fails to describe storing "user identifying information" in connection with Web page identifying information. Moreover, the cited art fails to describe the additional feature that "date-and-time" specifying information is also

stored in connection with the Web page identifying information. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

IV. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

10/31/07

By: _____

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on October 31 2007

STAAS & HALSEY

By: _____

Date: _____

10/31/07